

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. These claims were rejected as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
16 & 18-20	§102(e) Anticipation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Navarre (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,482).
1-15	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Navarre (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,482); and• Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APPA).

5 Applicant thanks the Examiner for the withdrawal of the last rejection and provides the discussion below distinguishing the present invention from the art cited against it and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks.

 Applicant's use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes
10 only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

 In the OA, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 as either being anticipated by Navarre, or obviated by the combination of Navarre and the admitted prior art (namely the publication of Jörn Heid, "Hand angelegt" in ix 11/1998, pp. 68-70 (Heid).

15 In the OA the Examiner accepts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Navarre as Navarre does not disclose that the data files that are transferred contain both language elements that are executable by the client as well as language elements that are executable by the server, and that it does not provide an interpreter that interprets and executes language elements on the gateway of the

data file. However, the Examiner asserts on p. 6 that the Applicant's admitted prior art discloses a technique in which it is possible to provide data files at the server that are called by the client and comprise language elements that can be executed both at the client as well as at the server. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate APPA's data files structured to contain both language elements executable at said client as well as language elements executable at said server in Navarre's network in order to execute elements at both the client and server.

10 In paragraph [0013], it is admitted that it is known to the art to have data files comprising language elements that can be executed both at the client as well as at the server. However, these on the server executable language elements are scripts of a different language, which involves considerable programming outlay (see paragraph [0027] of the present application).

15 Furthermore, it is not known from the prior art to integrate a gateway in the interpreter which can be simply called by language elements of the interpreter. In traditional systems, the corresponding interfaces can only be deposited at the server as CGI script, servlet, or the like, by way of programs that can be produced by specialists or must be mapped in an involved way of the known broker system (see paragraph [0028] of the present application).

20 The Examiner asserts that in Navarre, a gateway is integrated in an interpreter. However, Navarre is silent with regard to how the gateway accordingly is called after a corresponding request is received at the server. It

can be implemented in any number of different ways, and there is no teaching as to which way is used.

Navarre does also not disclose to provide one single data file for conducting the steps for executing a request from a client application as it is

5 shown in the flow chart of figure 3. In this respect, see Navarre, column 3, lines 56 to 59, which states:

10 With the integrated responses, the integrated response presentation routine 227 accesses application presentation objects, which preferably dynamically builds an HTML page for return to the client application 210.

If one single data file in HTML-language is provided for executing the request from a client application, it would not be necessary to dynamically build an additional HTML page. This is a clear indication that Navarre does not use
15 one single data file for controlling the execution of a request from a client but uses more than one data file.

A mere combination of Navarre with the publication of Heid does not lead to the invention. Firstly, there is no hint in Navarre to include all the method steps as shown in Figure 3 in one single data file. Secondly, the prior art of Heid
20 discloses a use of scripts for language elements to be carried out on the server. As explained above, it is not possible in traditional systems to include by simple language elements the control of the periphery devices in a data file, which is to be carried out at the client. It was only possible to deposit at the server the control of periphery devices by CGI script, servlets or the like, which can be
25 produced by specialists or must be mapped in an involved way at a known broker system.

the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in
this case.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,877)
Mark Bergner
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorney for Applicants
Customer Number 26574

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450 on February 16, 2006.

